DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 154 886 JC 780 301

AUTHOR Woods, Nancy A.
TITLE Instructional Development Services: A Project Evaluation.
INSTITUTION Kalamazoo Valley Community Coll., Mich.
PUB DATE 27 Jul 78
NOTE 35p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; *College Faculty; Community Colleges; Consultation Programs; Educational Development; Faculty Development; *Grants; *Instructional Improvement; Instructional Innovation; *Junior Colleges; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Teacher Administrator Relationship

ABSTRACT

The Kalamazoo Valley Community College (Michigan) Instructional Development Services (IDS) program was designed to provide consultation services for faculty wanting to develop and refine instructional strategies; to review grant proposals, award grants, and monitor faculty grant progress; and to provide faculty on-campus seminars for specific purposes or issues. An evaluation project aimed at answering four major questions about IDS: what IDS planned to accomplish, what procedures and criteria were employed in carrying out objectives, what activities and accomplishments directly resulted from IDS, and what impact IDS had on administrators, faculty, and students. Data came from a faculty survey, interviews with grant recipients who had finished their projects, interviews with IDS committee members, observations, and a review of documents. Although overall IDS success was found, IDS plans for 1975-76 were not specific and criteria for selection of faculty proposals were not established. IDS primarily affected administrators by increasing the time they devoted to instructional development activities and also increased faculty knowledge and skills. IDS impact on students was not adequately measured, although faculty and administrators generally perceived students as benefiting from IDS activities. Appendices cover IDS project implementation processes, evaluation report summaries, selected IDS grants, and an IDS proposal outline. (TR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED154886

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Nancy A. Woods

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT SERVICES: A PROJECT EVALUATION

prepared by
Nancy A. Woods

JC 780 301

Program Development Services

Kalamazoo Valley Community College

July 27, 1976

Table of Contents

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
	A. Nature of the Project	1
	B. Evaluation Goals	2
II.	Evaluation Design	2
III.	Limitations	5
IV.	Evaluation Findings	5
	A. Summary of Findings	6
	B. Specific Findings	6
V.	Conclusions and Suggestions	16
	Appendices:	
	A. Process for Implementing Instructional Development Services Project	20
	B. List of Summary Evaluation Reports	22
	C. List of Selected Instructional Development Grants	23
	D. Outline of Proposal for Instructional Development Services	

Introduction

Nature of the Project

Instructional Development Services was funded in 1974 through a Title III Advanced Institutional Development Program grant. Implementation of project activities and services began in the latter part of that year. From the grant proposal, Instructional Development Services (IDS) seeks "to provide support to help faculty members improve instruction at KVCC. This support includes (1) obtaining and providing consultation, expert advice, other forms of requested information as needed to develop innovations and respond to needed improvements in instruction; and (2) awarding and administering grants to support instructional development tasks authorized by the Dean of Instruction to improve instruction at KVCC" (AIDP Proposal, Nov., 1974:47).

During the first year of project implementation (FY 1975-76) effort was devoted to establishing procedures for awarding and monitoring grants, to selection and role development of faculty associates, and to providing faculty workshops and seminars. Project administrators developed priorities for the development of services, and these are reflected in the evaluation design. In general, IDS was to accomplish three activities:

1. Provide consultation service to faculty members who want to develop or refine instructional strategies. This consultation service was provided through "faculty associates", selected faculty members with expertise in various areas of instructional development.

2. Review faculty grant proposals, award grants, and monitor the progress of grants to faculty. An Instructional Development Services Committee was established to assist the Dean of Instruction in these tasks.

3. Provide faculty seminars on campus for specific purposes or issues for small numbers of participants. These seminars, also approved by the IDS Committee or provided by faculty associates, were conducted regularly throughout the year.

Administration of the project, as mentioned above, was provided primarily through the IDS Committee. This committee consisted of all instructional administrators (the Dean of Instruction and four Assistant Deans), two faculty members, and the Director of Student Assessment. A copy of the procedures for implementing grants is attached as Appendix A.

Evaluation Goals

Evaluation goals were stated in the evaluation proposal (Woods, 0/29/75) as:

1. To provide timely, adequate, and reliable information for decision making;

2. To provide a comprehensive design, analysis and reporting procedure which contributes to the body of knowledge regarding instructional development in the community college.

The overall project evaluation was designed to answer four major questions. These questions are presented in the following design section, with the data sources, data collection and analysis techniques.

Evaluation Design

Since the IDS project began implementing its services and procedures during the same period as this first evaluation, a formative evaluation design was the most appropriate. Consequently, the questions asked and reporting procedures used were designed to provide project administrators

with timely information about process variables. Although product data is also reported, primary emphasis is on data which will help to improve the project's procedures and other processes.

The first question which this evaluation proposed to address was: What did IDS plan to accomplish? This question will be answered through a variety of sources, including the IDS grant proposal, communications to faculty regarding the services offered by IDS, and project plans designated for action/completion in the 1975-76 Project Status Report. These documents will be reviewed and summarized.

The second question posed was: What procedures and criteria were employed to carry out IDS objectives? Variables considered relevant to this question, which will be discussed in the findings, were:

1. Effectiveness of information dissemination;
2. Simplicity of procedures for obtaining grants;
3. Effectiveness of procedures for monitoring grants;
4. Criteria which formed the basis for awards; and
5. Accessibility of IDS materials and personnel.

Data were collected from faculty members, award recipients, and the IDS Committee members.

The third question was formulated to provide a product analysis in its most limited sense, and to provide baseline data for a more indepth product analysis during 1976-77. All quantitative data available regarding activities conducted by IDS and grants proposed, awarded and/or completed are reported, and compared to objectives set by the committee for numbers of each activity to be conducted. These data will address the question: What activities/accomplishments were a direct result of IDS?

The final question posed also deals with IDS products, but it was addressed as a means of providing data for decision making. The question What impact has IDS had on administrators, faculty and students?, was

addressed to discover problems as well as accomplishments. Variables used to answer this question varied according to the target population. Variables analyzed regarding the project's impact on faculty were:

1. Awareness of the project;
2. Reasons faculty did or did not take part;
3. Validity attributed to the project's purposes;
4. Changes which have taken place as a result of IDS;
5. Unanticipated outcomes, both positive and negative.

Faculty who had received grants were asked questions regarding these variables:

1. What led to the project (project being faculty grant project);
2. What factors helped shape the project;
3. Why apply for an IDS grant;
4. Current status of the project;
5. Perceived effects on student learning;
6. Effects of individual projects or activities on other faculty members;
7. Effects regarding the participants' professional development status.

IDS Committee members were asked to give information regarding the effects IDS had on their perceptions and decisions. Variables included:

1. Changes in perceptions of faculty;
2. Changes in quantity and quality of faculty contacts;
3. Implementation of new courses, teaching methods, programs or other instructional innovations;
4. Changes in policies, practices or other instructional administration as a result of IDS;
5. Perceived changes in the quality of instruction.

The final target group which is impacted by IDS is students. Individual grant recipients were responsible for evaluation of their activities. The reports submitted for completed faculty projects will be reviewed for evaluative content. Also, faculty and administrator perceptions regarding IDS impact on and benefit to students will be reported.

Data were collected through a faculty survey, interviews with grant recipients who had completed their projects, interviews with IDS Committee members, observations, and a review of documents. Findings will be reported

according to the questions and variables listed above.

Limitations

The major limitation to be considered in this evaluation was the lack of product information. No baseline data were available regarding faculty development activities prior to IDS. Consequently, it is difficult to judge the success of IDS in terms of quantitative measures of activities. Also, several quantitative indices planned for analysis in the evaluation proposal were not collected and/or reported. These limitations, however, are not considered to be crucial, since the object of IDS evaluation for the past year was to provide process information for decision-making purposes.

Other than the lack of product data, a limitation was the response rate for the faculty survey, which was 46%. Since instruments were coded, the general nature of the non-respondents' characteristics could be assessed at least in part, however, and non-respondent characteristics were judged to be quite similar to respondent characteristics. The largest differences were the preponderance of IDS participants in the returns, and the lack of returns from the Social Science and Humanities Development Centers. These limitations should be considered, but are not debilitating for evaluation purposes.

Evaluation Findings

Findings are summarized for each major area of investigation. These areas are then further examined, including the methods used and the data base for each. The reader is referred to various summary reports which were compiled during the year for further information regarding methods and findings (see Appendix B).

Summary of Findings

1. IDS plans for Fy1975-76 were not specific. The general plan was to implement activities to accomplish project goals, stated in the "Nature of the Project" section of this report. Activities were implemented which relate directly to overall project goals.

2. Since criteria for selection of faculty proposals were not established (to the evaluator's knowledge), and since objectives for FY 1975-76 were not established, it is not feasible to address the question "What procedures and criteria were employed to carry out IDS objectives?". Procedures for faculty members to follow in proposing instructional development projects are attached as Appendix A. The variables listed in the evaluation design for this section will be reported as fully as possible, given these limitations.

3. Many activities were accomplished through IDS. Quantitative indicators established for judging the degree of success of the project show that in terms of activities proposed, inititated, and accomplished, IDS was very successful. Whether or not these accomplishments were a direct result of the implementation of IDS is not clear. Most instructional administrators indicated that IDS acted as a catalyst, increasing the number of instructional development activities, and enabling innovations to be implemented sooner than would have otherwise been possible.

4. The impact of IDS on administrators has been primarily to increase the amount of time they devoted to instructional development activities. The impact of IDS on faculty was directed toward those who were awarded grants. This impact was felt in terms of their own increased knowledge and skills, and in changes in their work. Other faculty members (non-participants) also gained knowledge and skills, through observing, discussing, and using the ideas and innovations of participants and faculty associates. The impact of IDS on students has not been adquately measured. Some indications of impact on students were reported by faculty and administrators, and these will be discussed. Generally, students are perceived as benefiting from IDS activities.

Specific Findings: What did IDS plan to accomplish?

The general goals for IDS are summarized in the "Nature of the Project" section of this report. From the IDS "Project Status Report", which gives tasks, responsibilities, expected results/measures, and target dates, a significant number of tasks planned for FY1975-76 dealt with implementing procedures and processes. Eight systems, processes or procedures (of the 27 specified tasks) were to be implemented. Other tasks dealt with the maintenance and

evaluation of processes and procedures.

The activities referenced by these tasks were: IDS faculty associates, a college-wide communication system, a system of campus programs on teaching methodologies, delivery systems for new instructional strategies, "challange grants", and faculty seminars. The "Project Status Report", prepared as part of the AIDP reporting requirements, gives some indication of emphasis areas. It does not provide a detailed plan of action, nor does it give enough information for the casual reader to understand what IDS activities are.

As part of evaluation activities, IDS Committee members were asked to set decision rules for judging the degree of success of IDS activities. These decision rules dealt with quantitative indices only. While the intended use of these decision rules was to make evaluative judgements, they also give an indication of the Committee's intentions for IDS activities during the past year. The following data items and numbers for judging success were developed by the evaluator and the IDS Committee:

DATA ITEM	DECISION RULE NUMBER
1. Number of faculty associates on duty.	5
2. Number of faculty started in training activities initiated by faculty associates.	10
3. Number of teaching methods activities for more than one faculty member planned by IDS Committee members or faculty associates.	7
4. Number of teaching methods activities for more than one faculty member implemented by IDS Committee members or faculty associates.	6
5. Number of faculty seminars held.	15
6. Number of challenge and/or instructional strategy grant proposals submitted.	30
7. Number of challenge and or instructional strategy grants awarded.	15
8. Number of challenge and/or instructional strategy grants implemented.	15
9. Number of challenge and/or instructional strategy grants completed.	10

The section regarding product findings will delineate data available for

each of the above data tiems. They are presented here to provide the reader with supplemental information regarding IDS planned activities.

What procedures and criteria were employed to carry out IDS objectives?

Several variables were developed for evaluation of IDS procedures and criteria. Data regarding these variable were collected through observation, document review, a survey of full-time faculty, and interview with IDS Committee members and grant recipients.

The first variable dealt with the effectiveness of information dissemination. Data to assess this variable through the faculty survey, and observation. In general, information and communications regarding IDS purposes, structure and activities was not effective. The faculty survey revealed that 17 of the 41 respondents feel they know what IDS offers and are familiar with an individual project. This finding was particularly interesting since 19 of the 41 had actually submitted a grant proposal to IDS, but only 13 of these IDS participants indicated knowledge of IDS project.

Survey respondents were asked to indicate if they had participated in an activity sponsored by IDS, and to name that activity. Three of the 19 faculty who responded to this question gave erroneous answers, attributing an activity to IDS which it was not responsible for. Two of these three were grant recipients. It appears therefore, that faculty who responded to the survey (46% of the population) were not very accurate in their perceptions of activities sponsored by IDS. Observation of IDS communications led this evaluator to judge subjectively that number of communications was sufficient, but proper identification of the activities being communicated as IDS sponsored was lacking. For example, a full-page

insert in the Faculty Focus dealt with faculty associates and their services but carried no reference to the fact that faculty associates are supported through and supervised by IDS.

Another problem of effective communications is considered to be a result of the fact that IDS is one of five projects initiated through the AIDP grant. Faculty members, it appears, are not aware of this, or at least are not aware that IDS has its own budget and administration. The misconceptions about IDS activities, as well as the extent to which IDS employs personnel, indicate a confusion about the various AIDP projects, or, a lack of recognition that AIDP is different projects.

Other variables designed to assess the procedures and criteria employed by IDS were the simplicity of procedures for obtaining grants, and the effectiveness of procedures for monitoring grants. Feedback from grant recipients indicated that there was a concern regarding direct communication with the IDS Committee when proposals were being reviewed, and at the completion of a faculty project. Faculty members would like more input into the review process, and have the opportunity to present their ideas in person, as well as a written proposal. Grant recipients were uncertain as to the status of their projects, upon completion. They would like to know if the Committee is considering any of their recommendations, and what opportunities could be available for communicating faculty project results with other faculty.

Regarding the simplicity of procedures for making proposals, the faculty survey revealed that the reason most often cited by non-participants for not submitting proposals was "Don't think the hassle of submitting a proposal is worth it". Since faculty members who actually went through the proposal process had few complaints about the procedures involved, non-participants

may be reflecting a misconception, or, an attitude. Non-participants may really believe that the procedures for submitting a grant proposal are a "hassle", or they may simply not be interested enough in instructional innovation to go through any formal channels.

Procedures for monitoring grants were not developed.

What activities/accomplishments were a direct result of IDS?

As was stated in the design section of this report, it is very difficult to ascertain which instructional development activities, and especially accomplishments, directly resulted from IDS. IDS did, however, sponsor and instigate a large number of activities, and this section of the report will examine the products developed under the aegis of IDS.

First, a total of 82 proposals were submitted to the IDS Committee for consideration since the project began. As noted above, the decision rule set by the Committee to judge the degree of success for this item was 30. Thus, actual attainment has been nearly three times what the IDS Committee would consider successful. Other quantitative items also exceeded the numbers set for judging project success. Notably, the Committee planned to have five faculty associates on duty, and six actually began providing services, during Spring Semester of 1976; the number of faculty members serviced by faculty associates was not reported, but a review of faculty associate activities reveals that far more than the ten specified for success received some form of training or assistance.

Of the 82 proposals submitted for consideration, approximately 60 were designed to either improve existing instructional offerings or

to initiate a new instructional offering. Ten of the proposals were related to professional development, such as attending a conference, and eight proposals were to conduct a workshop or seminar. The remainder of the proposals dealt with extending or supplementing previous proposals. A List of Selected Instructional Development Grants, prepared by the Dean of Instruction, is attached as Appendix C.

Other available records show that 13 proposed faculty projects were not authorized, 33 show funds approved, and 36 remain in the process of proposal review. Of the 33 projects which had funds authorized, 24 report the monies expended as of May 13, 1976. All of these quantitative indices of IDS products can be judged successful, using the decision rules stated on page 7.

Since the evaluation focused on the processes used for administrative feedback, a breakdown of monies authorized and expended is presented. According to the grant status report available to the evaluator, a total of $40,040.25 (plus 120 AU's for one project, $7.50 per hour for one project, and fringe benefits for eight projects) were authorized. Of these authorized funds, $17,976.87 were expended as of May 13, 1976. It may be conjectured that a relatively large sum was expended during June, 1976, to close out projects for the fiscal year.

Of the 22 grants for which both funds authorized and expended were reported, three grants expended over the authorized amounts (total = $226.98), nine grants reported expenditures under the authorized amount (total = $16,677.86), and ten grants showed expenditures equal to the funds authorized. For these same 22 projects, the total amount authorized

was $32,763.75. The total amount expended (again, as of May 13) was $16,312.87 resulting in a difference between authorized and expended funds of $16,450.88.

While this is a large discrepancy, it should be noted that 10 of the 22 projects showed equal funds authorized and expended, and that expenditures from May 13 to June 30, 1976 were not recorded in the last available IDS faculty grant report. It may be worthwhile for the IDS Committee to bring the grant report up to date, so more information is available about anticipated versus actual funds necessary for various types of faculty projects.

Some grant recipients did indicate a concern about funding provisions. At least three recipients did not realize the procedures for payments, and thus did not accurately predict the amount of money needed for their projects. This was due to a misconception about the amount of taxes and other withholdings.

Regardless of grant recipients' concerns, it should be noted that the response given by faculty most often when asked what factors led to their grant proposals was "Announcement of availability of funds through IDS". Also, instructional administrators indicated that availability of funds was the prime impetus for many innovations, although personal commitment and creativity were significant factors as well.

In addition to faculty grants, IDS supported six faculty associates. From faculty associate reports of their activities, a summary report was compiled. Highlights of their activities were:

1. Consultations were held with faculty regarding computer assisted instruction, guidance and counseling, audiovisual materials and usage, learning resources usage (other than audiovisual), health careers course improvements, and teaching methods in general.

2. Products developed by faculty associates or through their assistance were: presentation at a Computer Assisted Instruction Seminar and the Kalamazoo Guidance and Personnel Association, student competencies for four courses, self-instruction as an alternative teaching method for four courses, Media Catalogue File updated, a catalogue of the types of assignments instructors can use to involve students with Learning Resource Center materials, weekly meetings regarding clinic counseling, clinical competencies for dental hygiene procedures, a bi-weekly newsletter, and a series of small group meetings to discuss various teaching concepts and roles.

3. Faculty associates also spent some of their release time to improve their own skills, knowledge base, and courses.

All faculty associates indicated they had benefited from their experiences, and all recommended the positions continue during Fall Semester, 1976. Two problems were noted: 1) the difficulty and time involved in obtaining part-time replacements for faculty associates who require such replacements need to be considered when choosing faculty associates and assigning release time; 2) faculty involvement was limited due to a lack of release time for instructional development activities. It was suggested that all faculty be granted one-half day release time per week.

IDS also sponsored several seminars for faculty and staff. A complete list is not available, but included were an All-College Seminar Day, a Human Potential Seminar, and several "Sandwich Seminars" on various topics.

What impact has IDS on administrators, faculty and students?

Instructional administrators were interviewed to gather information about their perceptions of the changes in faculty contacts, policies and procedures, and the quality of instruction attributable to IDS. These interviews also included the two faculty representatives on the IDS Committee, since the Committee formed project administration.

Committee members were evenly split on the question, "Has IDS changed the amount of contact you have with faculty?" Of the four (of a possible eight) who gave a yes response to this question, all indicated IDS participation had increased the amount of faculty contacts. Three committee members indicated the quality of faculty contacts had increased.

On the average, committee members indicated that five to ten percent of their time is devoted to IDS matters each week. Only two committee members reported that their own style of work has changed as a result of IDS involvement. No new policies or procedures were noted.

Some of the instructional innovations considered to be most important in terms of long-term impact were:

Test generator
Faculty Associates
Legal Secretary Course
Competency Based English Program
Job Search Skills Course
Small Business Management Course
Courses using the Keller System of instruction

Committee members mentioned several areas which would support the positive effects of IDS on student learning and instruction. The most frequently mentioned areas were:

Students have a wider range of courses and teaching methods.
The role of the instructor is changing in that some of the redundant chores have been lessened and instructors have addressed course objective more thoroughly.
Several IDS projects have helped the disadvantaged learner, either directly or indirectly.

Faculty split into IDS participants and non-participants, during data collection. Faculty who had completed IDS projects were interviewed, and the faculty survey addressed itself to both groups.

Faculty who had completed grant projects indicated their project objectives had been achieved, and that the projects were a positive experience. Projects were viewed as having impact on people other than the grantee. Products are being utilized by other faculty, as well as students.

Of the 19 IDS faculty participants who responded to the faculty survey, 15 indicated the "announcement of availability of funds through IDS" was a factor which led to their proposals. Fourteen indicated "encouragement from a development center coordinator or other administrator", and 13 indicated they had a "gut-level feeling that the project would improve instruction".

Faculty were asked to respond to a series of statements regarding the role of an instructional development project or service. These statements were intended to provide a measure of faculty concensus about IDS goals and responsibilities. IDS participants agreed more often than non-participants with the statement: "IDS should provide a planned, systematic and open procedure for instructional development," and "A program like IDS should be a top priority this year to help maintain the vitality of instruction.

From these findings, it appears that IDS has had impact on participating faculty in several areas. It has provided the funds to implement their ideas, it has increased instructional development discussion and sharing, and it has increased the perception of instructional development as an on-going and needed service.

For faculty who have not participated in IDS activities, it may be too soon to measure any real effects. As stated above, faculty other than grant recipients have benefited indirectly from IDS projects

and activities. Also, faculty associates had not been approved at the time the faculty survey was conducted, so any impact they would have had was not reflected in responses to survey items.

IDS impact on students has been referred to in other parts of this report. Faculty were asked to give their perceptions of the impact of IDS on student learning. Only three respondents indicated IDS has had a positive effect on student learning, and no negative effects were cited. From the large number of blank and "don't know" types of responses, many faculty feel they do not know enough about IDS projects and activities to make a judgement. Other faculty members indicated that it is too soon to make judgements regarding IDS impact.

Faculty members who received IDS grants were responsible for individual project evaluations. From the information available, new courses and instructional methodology innovations have been very well received by students. Self-paced instruction has been a continuing topic for faculty projects, and one study, a comparative study using partial correlation coefficients to assess student achievement in self-paced versus traditional instruction showed a higher degree of student achievement in the self-paced approach. Two other popular topics, competency based education and computer assisted instruction, have not had any formal evaluation applied, due primarily to the degree of implementation (courses are just beginning to be offered using these approaches).

In summary, the impact of IDS on faculty, administrators, and students, as it has been measureable during this developmental year of project operation, has been positive.

Conclusions and Suggestions

The activities sponsored by IDS during the past year have been

directly related to the purpose and goals of the IDS project, as stated in the AIDP grant proposal. The activities have, however, been diverse in nature and have spoken to the needs and particular interests of participants. Participation in IDS activities, faculty grants in particular, has been higher than anticipated.

Products generated through IDS have brought satisfaction to those who were involved in their development, and are perceived as benefiting both administrator and faculty interested in instructional innovation, as well as providing real alternatives and subjects to students.

Suggestions regarding future IDS activities and concentration of effort are:

1. Continue to encourage faculty participation and commitment through supporting a wide range of interest and expertise areas.

2. Explore general faculty areas of concern for emphasis. This could be done during the scheduled Faculty Seminar Days. Genuine interest in and effective use of faculty input helps generate commitment to the project, as well as increasing communication and knowledge about IDS.

3. Be more rigorous in reporting the status and results of faculty projects. Good faculty projects need to be communicated more effectively to other staff in order to garner the full benefits of individual efforts. Results of projects need to be evaluated more systematically, not only to make decisions about future activities, but also to enable an overall IDS products evaluation to be conducted.

As stated in the evaluation design, this year evaluation efforts and methods were directed primarily toward assessing the effectiveness of processes, while products received a secondary emphasis. The remaining comments are related to improving IDS processes.

Instructional Development Services has produced a great many products with very few written management procedures. This fact attests to the commitment of instructional staff to instructional improvement and development.

While this is positive, it also intimates that even more could be accomplished through the development and use of more structured processes.

IDS has gone through a year of almost frantic activity, which is certainly not uncommon with a project of its magnitude and subject area. The frequency of this type of experience with new projects and programs spawned formative (process) evaluation, the purpose of which is not to judge the worth of a concept or outcomes, but to provide project administrators with recommendations for improving the processes by which concepts are operationalized and outcomes are generated. The following suggestions are offered in this framework.

1. Improve communications with faculty and staff. This is needed in order to increase participation. Again, one method would be to use part of a Faculty Seminar Day, to explain IDS goals, activities and accomplishments, as well as to solicit reactions and ideas. Make a point of identifying activities as IDS sponsored, especially in official communications such as the Faculty Focus.

2. Develop a monitoring system for faculty grants. This would not have to elaborate, a monthly memo from each grantee stating their progress/problems would suffice.

3. Have at least one "open" committee meeting every two months. Publicize it as a meeting where interested faculty can hear topics of general interest and lay their ideas before a relevant group. Besides aiding communications, this would help dispell the idea that IDS hires new staff and make institution-wide decisions.

4. Select someone, in addition to, if not other than, the Dean of Instruction to conduct the day-to-day administrative aspects of the project. Part of the lack of attention to management functions such as communications and grant monitoring, in this evaluator's opinion, has been due literally to a lack of administrative time.

5. Review IDS Committee membership each year. Reviewing proposals and developing plans, given the quantity with which the Committee has had to deal, is intellectually draining. Instructional development is a creative activity, and, like most creative activities, requires fresh approaches and rest periods. Also, each IDS Committee member has full-time duties in addition to IDS, and these may suffer over a three-year time span.

In conclusion, the Instructional Development Services Project at KVCC has produced a wide variety of instructional innovations and contributed to faculty and administrator interest in instructional development. These successes are highly commended. Further improvement can be made in the processes utilized to produce instructional innovations and increase faculty commitment to instructional development.

KALAMAZOO VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Process for Implementing Instructional Development Services Project

Stage	Person Responsible	Expected Documentation	Decision Criteria	Decision Authority
PROPOSAL	Proposer	Written Proposal for development stage which includes information indicated in "Proposal Outline."	(1) Student and community need is evident. (2) Need is compatible with KVCC objectives. (3) Resources apparently obtainable. (4) Faculty member sees proposal as positive contribution to college development.	Dean of Instruction
DEVELOP-MENT	Developer	Project Operating Plan which should include: Identify Resources Needed (1) Staff Duties & responsibilities of each position or assignment (2) Facilities needed List of equipment; list material for first semester or year. (3) Budget Request for budget allocation (4) Special arrangements Draft news releases, brochures, letters or contracts. Recommend acquisitions by the LRC. Statement of Results Expected (5) Project purpose, objectives, activities, and design for project evaluation. (6) Summary of instructional system including new, or changes in syllabus or program. (7) Decision on commitment of appropriate resources (staff, facilities, budget, arrangenebts) needed for implementation stage if appropriate.	(1) Resources needed have been committed. (2) Operating plan & course syllabus are complete and approved. (3) Special arrangements are complete and within college policy. (4) Qualified supervisor is assigned.	Dean of Instruction Dean of Instruction (or other Dean if in his area of responsibility)

Appendix A

Stage	Person Responsible	Expected Documentation	Decision Criteria	Decision Authority
REPORTING	Project Director	Project Report which includes: (1) Summary of activities completed. (2) Expenditure Report (3) Documentation of new materials, aids, or other results produced. (4) Conclusions and recommendations concerning any further actions within KVCC which are related to the project purpose and objectives. (5) Evaluation report from CARES, or report of other independent evaluation. (6) Copy for news releases, as appropriate. (7) Statement on rights to specially developed materials. These statements will be consistent with the USOE "General Provisions for Programs" concerning copyrights. If further implementation is recommended a plan for full implementation should include: (8) A written plan for instructional system. (9) Anticipated results if system utilized. (10) A time line indicating when system can be implemented. (11) A statement of the relationship of the system to current Instructional System Profile at KVCC. (12) A written process for gathering follow-up data on implementation of system.	(1) Is information available to indicate whether or not the project was successful (fulfilled its intended purpose)? (2) Did the program or course reach its stated objectives? (3) Is evidence available to indicate that the original need has been (is being) satisfied? (4) If problems arose what recommendations are appropriate? (5) To whom should information on completion of the program be provided?	Project Director

Appendix B

List of Summary Evaluation Reports

1. IDS Faculty Survey Report (Woods; 1/23/76).
2. IDS Faculty Survey Report Follow-up and Granter Interviews Report (Woods; 2/3/76).
3. IDS Committee Interview Report (Woods; 4/8/76).
4. Faculty Associate Activity Report (Woods; 6/8/76).
5. IDS Committee Observation Report (Woods; 8/28/76).

Appendix C

Selected Instructional Development Grants

LANSCAPE PLANTS

David Armintrout - Instructor, Landscape and Turf Management (Part-time)

Primary objective is to develop a basic set of slides which will be used to identify and familiarize the students with a large number of plants.

BASIC COMMUNI[illegible]TION SKILLS IMPROVEMENT
(Alpha Englis[illegible] Revision)

John Corbin - Instructor, Foundations Development Center

Intended to make the program more accessible and useful to a wider range of students entering with a wider range of competencies.

REAL ESTATE MATH

Marlin Gerber - Instructor, Business Careers Development Center

Objective was to design an effective and flexible course to fit the needs of students requiring math skills in real estate and preparation for the state board examination.

ELECTRONICS 100 MODULES

Jack Lotz - Instructor, Technical Services Careers

This project was for the design and construction of modular units for the learning of electrical fundamentals in ELE. 100.

SHARED TIME LEGAL SECRETARY

Wanda Hoy - Instructor, Office Careers Development Center

Designed to satisfy the needs of high school students preparing to become legal secretaries.

KELLER PLAN

Rick Margelis - Instructor, Science Development Center

Development of the Keller plan, self-paced system of instruction for Chemistry 101, allowing students to study at own pace, interact with instructor on a one-to-one basis and gain tutorial help needed in any area of the course material.

CHEMISTRY 121

Rick Margelis - Instructor, Science Development Center

This course is designed for students who wish to attain the experience they need to feel confident in an industrial laboratory allowing for attainment of necessary basic skills in a relatively short period of time.

HCR 117 - CHEMISTRY

Rick Margelis - Instructor, Science Development Center

Course developed as an alternative route for students, such as a self-paced or self-instructional track of individual units of comprising the content of HCR-117 Chemistry. Allows Health Careers students options to gaining admission to their respective program.

DEVELOPMENT OF ORAL PATHOLOGY LEARNING PACKAGES

Ellie Callander - Health Careers Development Center (Part-time)

To revise the individualized learning packages prepared for DHY 204-Oral Pathology.

DEVELOPMENT OF HEALTH AIDE TRAINING COURSE

Mary Scott - Co-Coordinator - Health Careers Development Center

Creation of this course provides an opportunity for employment in health related field for students who are unable to meet the criteria or commit themselves to the long period of training required for other health programs.

INTRODUCTION TO POLITICAL SCIENCE

Dr. Thomas J. Saxon - Social Science Development Center

Development of a new course in Political Science comprised of self-instruction modules which incorporates both the open lab and self-paced educational concepts.

SMALL BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

Dr. Robert Wollam - Business Careers Development Center

Objective was to design a course in Small Business Management which would enable the student to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to successfully operate a small business.

ORIENT TRIP

William Keith - Instrutor, Leisure Studies (Part-time)

Attended the center for Uechi Ryu Karate in the Orient. Trip resulted in 3000 feet of movies to be kept in film library at the college and 50 slides for the Learning Resources Center to be used for both Karate and Bio Feedback.

A-V SEMINAR

Gloria Noble - Supervisor, Office Careers Lab

Will attend Audio-Visual - Tutorial Summer 1976 Seminar presented by Media Systems Corporation, LaCrosse, Wisconsin

PHILOSOPHY 100 TELEVISION SERIES

Irene Woodall and Team - Co-Coordinator - Health Careers Development Center

Preparation of a series of ten video-tapes to be broadcase over cable television and offered for college credit.

JOB SEARCH SKILLS

Joanne Wright- Instructor, Foundations Development Service

Course designed as a one credit module covering Personal Assessment, The Job Search, Writing of Resumes, and Job-Interview Techniques.

A-V CONFERENCE

Eugene Radtke - Learning Resource Center Reference Librarian

Attended National Audio-Visual Institute Conference, Indiana Unversity, Bloomington, Indiana.

MACHINE REPAIR

Phillip Maneikis and William Ayres, Instructors - Industrial Production Careers

Preparation of course syllabus, demonstration materials, student handouts, lab assignments, supplemental materials, and construction of teaching aides for Machine Repair Course.

COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION

Mickey McWilliams - Assistant Dean of Instruction - Business and Technology

Introduction and development of computer assisted instruction at Kalamazoo Valley Community College.

A-V CONFERENCE

Terrel Coburn - Media Production Center

Attendance at Effective Communications Conference, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

APPENDIX D

KALAMAZOO VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Outline Of Proposal for Instructional Development Services
Step 2

Proposer:

Date:

1) Need for Project

Describe the need for the project. What problems led you to propose this project? Provide figures or statistics which clarify your statements.

2) Project Objectives

3) Project Activities

Each activity should relate to one or more of the objectives. Use attached sheet.

4) Evaluation

Include the plan for evaluating the results/products of this project.

A. Who will conduct the evaluation.

B. Evaluation Schedule.

C. When will evaluative results be available?

5) Budget

Wages/Salaries & Fringe Benefits (name person or position)	_____
Consultants & Professional Services	_____
Materials & Supplies	_____
Other Expenses	
Travel	_____
Printing	_____
Media Services	_____
Advertising	_____
Miscellaneous	_____
TOTAL	$_____

6) Results Expected

7) Reporting

When will reports be submitted? To whom?

Interim reports should include:
1. Status of project activities.
2. Evaluation status.
3. Expenditures to date.

Final reports should include:
1. Documentation of new materials, aids, or other products.
2. Evaluation results.
3. Conclusions and recommendation concerning any further actions within KVCC related to this project's purpose and objectives.

IDS Proposal

Proposer:

Date:

Activity	Person Responsible	Others Involved	Result/Measure	Dates	
				Begin	End

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUL 2 1978

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES